

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

CHARLES JAMES WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

LUKE LARSON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-00599-RSL-GJL

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Noting Date: July 10, 2025

The District Court referred this action to United States Magistrate Judge Grady J. Leupold. Plaintiff Charles James Williams, proceeding *pro se*, filed a Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (“IFP”) and Proposed Civil Rights Complaint (“Complaint”) under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Dkts. 1, 1-1.

On April 24, 2025, the Court screened Plaintiff’s Complaint and found it was deficient. Dkt. 4. As Plaintiff failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court declined to order service of the Complaint. *Id.* However, the Court provided Plaintiff leave to file an amended pleading by May 27, 2025, to cure the deficiencies identified in the Order. *Id.* Further, the Court declined to rule on the IFP Motion (Dkt. 1) until Plaintiff responded to the Court’s

1 April 24, 2025, Order. Dkt. 4. The Court warned that failure to adequately address the issues  
2 identified in the Order would result in the Court recommending dismissal of this action. *Id.*

3 Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's Order. He has not filed a response to the  
4 Order or filed an amended complaint. Further, as discussed in the Order, Plaintiff has failed to  
5 state a claim upon which relief can be granted in the Complaint. *See* Dkt. 4. Therefore, the Court  
6 recommends this case be **DISMISSED without prejudice** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

7 Plaintiff's IFP Motion (Dkt. 1) should be **DENIED as moot**.

8 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the parties  
9 shall have fourteen (14) days from service of this report to file written objections. *See also* Fed.  
10 R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of  
11 appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985); *Miranda v. Anchondo*, 684 F.3d 844, 848  
12 (9th Cir. 2012) (citations omitted). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the  
13 Clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on July 10, 2025, as noted in the caption.

14  
15 Dated this 25th day of June, 2025.

16  
17 

18 Grady J. Leupold  
19 United States Magistrate Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24